UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/510,506	01/05/2005	Heinz Von Der Kammer	P67785US1	6896
	7590 04/08/200 OLMAN PLLC	EXAMINER		
400 SEVENTH SUITE 600	STREET N.W.	SHEN, WU CHENG WINSTON		
WASHINGTON, DC 20004			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1632	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/08/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/510,506	VON DER KAMMER ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
WU-CHENG Winston SHEN	1632	

	WO-CHEING WIIISION SHEN	1032						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress					
THE REPLY FILED 12 March 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.								
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apple for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Comperiods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance v	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request					
a) The period for reply expires 5 months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.							
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth i ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	date of the final rejection	n.					
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CER 1.136(a). The date	f).							
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed,								
may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL		,,, -						
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp								
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any externation Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w			e appeal. Since a					
AMENDMENTS								
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, I (a) They raise new issues that would require further con 			cause					
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo		L below),						
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet	•	lucina or simplifyina th	ne issues for					
appeal; and/or	tor form for appear by materially rec	adoming or omnipmyming th	10 100400 101					
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.						
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1	16 and 41.33(a)).							
4. $oxedsymbol{oxed}$ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12			PTOL-324).					
5. $igtigtiggl[iggl]$ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):	·							
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al non-allowable claim(s).			_					
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an ex	xplanation of					
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:								
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>22</u> .								
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>1-13, 16-21 and 2</u>	<u>3</u> .							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 								
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	ıl and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a					
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER								
 The request for reconsideration has been considered bu <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:					
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)							
13. Other:	, , , 							
	/Valarie Bertoglio/							
	Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1632						

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Claim 22 is proposed to be cancelled. Proposed new claim 24 reads as follows: An assay for screening for a modulator of the minor vault protein ADPRTL1, whereby said modulator is modulating substances consisting of a translation product of a gene coding for a vault protein, the minor vault protein ADPTRL1 as shown in SEQ ID NO: 2, and the method comprising: (a) contacting a cell with a test compound; (b) measuring the activity and/or level of the substances recited; (c) measuring the activity and/or level of the substances in a control cell not contacted with the test compound; and (d) comparing the levels and/or activities of the substances in the cells of step (b) and (c), wherein an alteration in the activity and/or level of substances in the contacted cells indicates that the test compound is a modulator of Alzheimer's disease.

The proposed cancellation of claim 22, if entered, would render the rejection of claim 22 moot. Proposed new claim 24 is different in scope compared to claim 22 with regard to (i) what is encompassed by "modulating substances", and (ii) what is the assay screening for, that would require further consideration and/or search. For instance, the proposed new claim 24 raises new issues that would require further consideration and/or search in terms 112 second for reciting a positive step relating back to the preamble. The proposed new claim 24 also raises new issues that would require further consideration and/or search for prior arts pertaining to "screening for a modulator of the minor vault protein ADPRTL1" recited in the preamble.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments have failed to overcome the scope of enablement rejection of claim 22 under 35 USC 112 first because Applicant's arguments rely on the proposed claim amendments, which have not been entered. The rejection is maintained of the record.